

P
bind together
College

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 30 1953

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

EDITOR

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, *Purdue University*

EDITORIAL BOARD

FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, *Duke University*; LOUIS FORSDALE, *Teachers College, Columbia University*; W. NELSON FRANCIS, *Franklin and Marshall College*; STEWART S. MORGAN, *The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas*; PORTER G. PERRIN, *University of Washington*; SAMUEL WEINGARTEN, *Chicago City Junior College, Wright Branch*

Vol. IV	February, 1953	No. 1
WHAT EMPLOYERS EXPECT FROM COLLEGE COURSES IN COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION— <i>T. R. Schellenberg</i>		3
THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNICATION FOR ADVANCEMENT IN INDUSTRY— <i>W. K. Bailey</i>		11
THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY PROGRAM OF TRAINING FOR TEACHING COMPOSITION— <i>Philip R. Wikelund</i>		14
TEACHING CRITICAL READING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL TESTS— <i>Paul B. Diederich</i>		19
THE TEACHING OF STYLE— <i>Norman Nathan</i>		22
A WHY AND HOW FOR FRESHMAN COMPOSITION— <i>George D. Stout</i>		25
SECRETARY'S REPORT No. 6— <i>Jerome W. Archer</i>		27
SECRETARY'S REPORT No. 7— <i>Jerome W. Archer</i>		29
EDITORIAL COMMENT		31
CCCC SPRING MEETING, 1953		32

College Composition and Communication is published quarterly in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter June 28, 1950, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to W. Wilbur Hatfield, 211 West 68th Street, Chicago 21, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to George S. Wykoff, University Hall, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

National Council of Teachers of English Conference on College Composition and Communication

1953 OFFICERS

KARL W. DYKEMA, Chairman
Youngstown College

T. A. BARNHART, Associate Chairman
State Teachers College, St. Cloud

JEROME W. ARCHER, Assistant Chairman
Marquette University

BEVERLY E. FISHER, Secretary
Santa Monica City College

W. WILBUR HATFIELD, Treasurer
211 West 68th St., Chicago

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, Editor
Purdue University

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Universities

HAROLD B. ALLEN, Minnesota

RICHARD S. BEALE, Boston Univ.

GEORGE P. FAUST, Kentucky

IRWIN GRIGGS, Temple

JOHN C. HODGES, Tennessee

GLENN H. LEGGETT, Washington

HENRY W. SAMS, Chicago

FRANCIS SHOEMAKER, Teachers College,
Columbia

MCDONALD WILLIAMS, Wilberforce

KARL YOUNG, Brigham Young

Liberal Arts Colleges

WAYNE C. BOOTH, Haverford

L. A. KING, Muskingum

STRANG LAWSON, Colgate

CARL LEFEVRE, Pace

JAMES H. MASON, Indian Springs School

SISTER MIRIAM JOSEPH, C.S.C., St. Mary's
(Indiana)

WATERS TURPIN, Morgan State

F. EARL WARD, Macalester

Teachers Colleges

PAUL W. BARRUS, East Texas State

WILLIAM T. BEAUCHAMP, Geneseo

JEAN MALMSTROM, Western Michigan
College of Education

KATHERINE SCOTT, Georgia State College
for Women

Technical Schools

HOWARD R. BARTLETT, Mass. Inst. Tech.

EMMA BEEKMAN, Los Angeles Trade and
Tech.

T. J. FARR, Tenn. Polytech. Inst.

HERBERT B. NELSON, Oregon State

ROBERT E. TUTTLE, General Motors Inst.

Junior Colleges

DONALD BIRD, Stephens

GLADYS BROWN, Little Rock

JOSIAH L. GEIST, Wright

GORDON MILLS, Los Angeles

MARGUERITE H. MOREY, Colby Jr.

What Employers Expect from College Courses in Composition and Communication¹

820.6
C68

T. R. SCHELLENBERG²

I am happy to speak to you on the subject, "What Employers Expect from Freshman Courses in Composition and Communication." In writing me about this topic, your chairman observed that it is "a bit cumbrous," and that it might be restated as: "What will a college graduate have to be able to do in the way of writing and speaking in order to do his job well?" One might infer from this restatement of the topic that the usual college graduate has not been exposed to more English courses than those given in the freshman year. If this inference is correct, then perhaps what is needed is an exposure of the college student to more English courses rather than an improvement of those that are provided for the freshmen.

I am not a master of the English language, and I will therefore speak to you as an amateur. For a number of years my writings have been subjected to the editorial strictures of grammarians on the public payroll, and I therefore have grave doubts about my ability to speak on acceptable English. My doubts are so enhanced in the presence of a group such as yours that I would be loath to proceed if I had not written down what I want to say, and if my writing had not been properly reviewed before I left Washington.

I'm not sure that I ought to speak even as an amateur on the topic that is under discussion in this session, for I am not altogether conversant with the needs of

the Government in the way of writing and speaking ability. I'm not engaged in informational or editorial work, nor have I ever taken pains to ascertain what is required in the way of training for such work.

If there is a justification for my speaking as a representative of the Government, it is this: My agency, the National Archives and Records Service, is perhaps as acutely aware as any agency of the Government of the problems created in writing. One of the four organizational elements of the agency is a Records Management Division, which is trying to promote good practices in the creation, maintenance, and disposition of Government papers. The size of its problem can be indicated by statistics, to which Government clerks always resort when words fail them. Statistics show that the Government buys 34,560,000 pencils a year. Try to visualize 34,560,000 pencils being pushed around on paper each year by Government clerks. The results are appalling. About a billion letters are written, and records are accumulated at the rate of two and one-half million cubic feet a year. So many records are now in existence that seven Pentagon buildings would be required to house them. These statistics show that writing has created at least one real problem in the Federal Government. It is the problem of mass. It is one resulting from the quantity—not the quality—of writing in the Government. This is the problem with which the Records Management Division has to deal.

The organizational element of the National Archives and Records Service with

¹ An address at the spring meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Cleveland, Ohio, March 28, 1952

² Director of Archival Management, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C.

which I am immediately associated is concerned, on the other hand, with the quality—not the quantity of Government papers. The National Archives provides a repository for the products of the pen that have a quality that justifies their preservation. While we are aware of the literary quality of the documents we preserve, I should note that our primary concern is with the quality of their contents.

Another organizational element of the National Archives and Records Service is the Division of the Federal Register, which is primarily concerned with legal writings. Its main job is to publish Federal statutes, regulations, orders, and notices that have public effect.

Officials of the National Archives and Records Service can thus view Government writing from a vantage point that is afforded in few other places in Washington. In the Records Management Division a view can be obtained of its quantity, in the National Archives of its literary quality, and in the Federal Register Division of its legal quality. And besides this, we also write letters—a small part of the billion that are written each year in the Government agencies.

From our vantage point what impressions does one gain of the Government needs of communicative ability? Before I venture to make suggestions on the training of students to meet these needs, I should like to make a few observations about Government writing. I shall make these in reference to a few questions that I shall bring to your attention.

The first of these questions is: What sort of Government jobs require writing ability? The jobs in the Federal Government may be divided into three general classes: first, the executive, administrative, and supervisory; secondly, the professional and scientific; and thirdly, the clerical and manual. In a typical agency the personnel in the first class consti-

tutes about fifteen percent of the total, while the other two classes make up the eighty-five percent.

The fifteen percent, namely the administrators, executives, and supervisors, are concerned with the development of organization and programs and with the formulation of policies, decisions, and procedures that are designed to accomplish the functions for which the agency was established. Their activities are reflected in administrative orders, staff instructions, manuals of operation, policy statements, directives, memoranda, correspondence, and the like.

The other eighty-five percent are concerned with activities necessary to carry out the programs of the agency. Most of these activities are of a specialized nature, so that those who perform them are selected primarily on the basis of their attainments in specialized fields, such as law, economics, statistics, history, chemistry, geology, physics, and other sciences. These employees need have no special training as writers or speakers, though a large part of their time is spent in writing reports, letters, and the like. Among these specialized fields none is more important than law, for a large part of the Government's work is of a legal character. This is true of practically all work in the judicial branch and also of much of the work performed by regulatory and quasi-judicial agencies in the executive branch of the Government. Old-line regulatory agencies are now supplemented by a number of emergency regulatory agencies. Their work results in the issuance of regulations, orders, and directives, usually aimed at the public, which have legal effect, and which, as I noted before, are published in the *Federal Register*. Their regulations, as I perhaps need not tell you, reach to an embarrassing degree into almost every phase of our daily lives—and our pocketbooks. A knowledge of law is

required, furthermore, in many other Federal activities, and particularly in fiscal activities that result in legal agreements, such as leases, titles, and contracts. Finally, a large part of the activities of an agency are of a "house-keeping," and frequently of a routine nature, such as those relating to personnel, property, supply, and fiscal matters.

In a word, then, most Government jobs require primarily either executive ability, professional or scientific competency, or manual or clerical dexterity; and only secondarily writing ability. Less than three-tenths of one percent of the classified civilian employees of the Government are engaged in activities that require specialized training in English, according to information I recently obtained from the U. S. Civil Service Commission. I might interject that I regard this statistic—as I do most other statistics—with considerable suspicion, for under pressure from Congress many agencies recently reduced the number of Informational, Editorial, and Public Relations Specialists by giving them different titles. Nonetheless, only a very few—those who must handle press and public relations or perform editorial duties—are selected primarily on the basis of their training as writers.

My second question is this: Under what conditions is writing done in the Government? Before answering this question, let me explain briefly how a typical Government agency operates. It is organized, as a rule, on a hierarchical pattern. At its top are found the administrators, executives, and supervisors, to whom I have already referred. Beneath this body of officials are found a series of offices, each subordinate to the one above it. Under this arrangement most important transactions are referred to each of the offices of the hierarchy, and the writings pertaining to such transactions are successively reviewed at each

administrative level as they flow upward through channels to completion. Lawyers review legal documents for the various technicalities and niceties of language that are the concern—and perhaps the substance—of their profession. Executives review administrative documents for conformity to policy, procedures, program emphasis, and the like. Each of the series of offices in the hierarchy usually contributes its bit to the particular paper that is referred to it—to a policy statement, a legal document, or a regulation. Few pieces of writing, indeed, are the product of just one person; more frequently they are developed through the efforts of a number of persons, who are "coordinated" or "directed" in their work. In the Government, then, writing is usually done on a collaborative basis, and the product of any one individual is usually embodied in that of the office to which he is attached.

Another condition is that writing in the Government is done anonymously. If a piece of writing is produced by a particular individual, credit is seldom given to him. Letters, memoranda, reports, are written for someone else's signature; a monograph will come out with the author's name subordinated to the name of the official under whose "direction" it has been written.

Finally, Government writing that is intended for publication is carefully edited. The volume of such writing is prodigious, as is evident from the fact that the Government Printing Office is one of the largest publishing concerns in the world. The editing of copy for publication is done by the small group of trained writers, to whom I have already referred, whose job it is to clean up the written products of the Government personnel before releasing them to be read outside the family. Government employees seldom have the good fortune of writing anything in which their pride

survives the miseries of editing and printing.

Under the circumstances I have just described, a wonderful opportunity is provided to those who like to tamper with the writings of others. Though man is naturally inclined to tamper, the Government provides an artificial stimulus to this inclination. Since documents have to be considered in each of the offices to which they are referred, the easiest way to dispose of them is to tamper with their language. Editorial corrections, therefore, are frequently made simply to show that documents have been reviewed—if not for content, then at least for style and grammar. Such corrections, in fact, are marks of authority, for the right to tamper is a prerogative of office.

While promoting the inclination to tamper with the writings of others, the circumstances I have described have a more important result. It is that they discourage self-expression. The Government obviously affords little opportunity for self-expression when the writing of an individual is submerged in that of his office. The successive reviews of each piece of writing, in fact, are likely to blunt the literary aspirations of any but the most persevering. Reviewers are apt to eliminate peculiar language twists and expressions, which are the essence of style, and to make the writing conform to a deadly impersonal style of which I wish to speak more later. I do not mean to say that Government agencies are in any sense opposed to the general desire of their employees to express themselves in writing so long as their self-expression does not misrepresent or damage the effectiveness of the Government. But on the other hand, the salaries paid by agencies must not be regarded as subsidies in support of self-expression. Public servants are paid to disguise themselves as anonymous parts of a heartless

mechanism. The Government can afford to pay its employees only for what they contribute to the fulfilment of its functions. And most Government functions are served by writing only as it is a means of communicating ideas. Writing is thus merely a working process, not an end product. The Government is simply not concerned with the literary quality of the writing of its employees, though occasionally, despite the discouragement to self-expression, eminent literary figures have served the Government. During the last century, for example, Washington Irving and James Russell Lowell produced interesting diplomatic dispatches, which are preserved among the State Department records in the National Archives. Walt Whitman was a Government clerk at one time, but he was dismissed by the Secretary of the Interior just after the outbreak of the Civil War. His sin was the production of *Leaves of Grass*, which the Secretary found in snooping around his desk. The Secretary wrote privately that he did not want to "employ the author of a scandalous book." Publicly, that is, for the record, he fired Whitman under an order that required the dismissal of all employees who are "disloyal," who "are not necessary for the transaction of the public business, or who are inefficient," and who "disregard in their conduct, habits and associations the rules of decorum [and] propriety prescribed by a Christian civilization."

The third question I want to consider is this: What are the qualities of Government writing? I plan to consider the good qualities, as well as the bad, for there are some good qualities.

A great deal has been written about Government writing. It is referred to variously as "bureaucratese," "governmentese," "Federalese," and "gobbledygook." The term "gobbledygook" was defined by its author, Maury Maverick, as

"talk or writing which is long, pompous, vague, involved, usually with Latinized words" (*New York Times Magazine*, May 21, 1944.) The latest word used to describe Government jargon is "baffle-gabb," which was coined by Milton A. Smith of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce (*Washington Post*, January, 1952). Glossaries of "gobbledygook" or its modern equivalent "baffle-gabb" are published from time to time in Washington newspapers. I have used a few "gobbledygook" words in my paper, and I want to give you definitions of their meaning as taken from a popular Washington column by Jerry Klutz called the "Federal Diary." I referred to documents flowing through "channels." "Channels" are defined as "the trails left by interoffice memoranda." I noted that the documents flow upward through "channels" from one office to another. The term "referred to a higher authority" is defined as "pigeonholed in a more sumptuous office." This flow of documents is "expedited," which means that "confusion is confounded with commotion." One of the amazing things in the official life of Washington is the jargon that has been developed to describe official activities. One does not deal with a matter under a certain description—one handles it within a certain "framework," and everything, of course, follows a certain "directive." One does not refer to a matter at hand as a specific problem—one refers to the assignment as an "*ad hoc* detail." One of our staff members once helped write a satire on *Federal Prose: How to Write in and/or for Washington*. It is James R. Masterson, who is now on the staff of the National Historical Publications Commission, which is part of our agency.

I do not mean to deride Government writing. I believe there are explanations for the form it takes, and I think you

ought to bear with me as I give them to you.

A Government employee has to write in an impersonal and deferential tone, and in doing so he gets himself involved in colorless verbiage, in circumlocutions, in complex sentence structures for which he would be the first to disclaim responsibility, if he could. The employee, mind you, is a servant of the people, to whom he must be deferential, for the people, in the last analysis, are his collective masters. The employee cannot afford to become familiar with the people. If he does, he is likely to get into trouble, as has been the case with a number of Internal Revenue collectors recently. The employee has learned to be deferential to the Congress, which holds in its hand strings to the purse from which appropriations for his salary are made. The employee, of course, must be deferential to his superiors. If, under the circumstances, he writes in an unctuous and self-effacing manner, who can blame him? And if he should write otherwise, it is certain that his writing would be stripped of all personal elements in the course of the successive reviews that are given it. If he is engaged in legal work, his language, of course, will have to be clothed in legal verbiage. Every document he writes will be liberally sprinkled with "whereases" and "where-untos."

The real explanation of the use of "gobbledygook" in the Federal Government is a very simple one. It is the one applied by Samuel Johnson in another context: "Ignorance, Sir, sheer ignorance." The hackneyed expressions, the big words that have acquired special connotations in Government circles, are simply a cover-up for a lack of language ability. While acquiring a vocabulary, everyone passes through the stage in which long words are found to be fascinating. When we were children we

were applauded for using long words. "We spake as children," to quote the Apostle Paul. But when we grew up, we cast aside the youthful inclination to choose a Latin polysyllable when a four-letter word of Anglo-Saxon derivation would serve just as well. Government clerks who use long words have just not grown up. They are like children who seek to impress by their impish antics. I can cite an authority in support of this viewpoint. It is Henry Watson Fowler, who says in his *Dictionary of Modern English Usage* that "those who run to long words are mainly the unskillful and tasteless; they confuse pomposity with dignity, flaccidity with ease, and bulk with force."

Now there is a widespread belief that the Government deliberately fosters the writing of "gobbledygook." This is an error. The Government operates through the persons who head its agencies and bureaus; and I doubt whether any agency head, bureau head, divisional director, or other official today actually approves of such writing. The truth is that they simply do not know how to stop it. The fault lies rather in the great multitude of lesser employees who come into the Government either deficient in the taste or skill to do better or under the mistaken impression that it is expected of them. Every other day some agency head makes a statement deprecating the use of "gobbledygook" or issues an order to his subordinates outlawing it.

Some efforts have been made, notably by the Federal Security Agency and the Department of Agriculture, to make the writing of easily intelligible prose a subject of continued emphasis and training. Both of these agencies have prepared good instructional pamphlets based upon the manuals of James F. Grady and Milton Hall (*Writing Effective Government Letters*). In the Soil Conservation Service an attempt has been made to intro-

duce the readability tests of Dr. Rudolf Flesch in judging material intended for wide distribution; and the Civil Service Commission has circulated pamphlets advocating the use of these tests. During the last war the OPA, faced with the necessity of explaining price regulations to all the small retail stores of the country, tried very determinedly and with some success to make its lawyer writers draft their regulations in simple direct terms.

The standards for effective writing established by all the agencies that I have mentioned are not essentially different from the standards commonly taught in the schools. Dr. Flesch approaches them from the negative side, developing a formula for measuring the qualities of writing, which in his opinion offer the chief impediments to easy reading; and whether they are indeed the chief impediments or not, they are impediments of some magnitude. In the Federal Security manual (based upon Grady and Hall) the standards of effective writing are approached on the positive side and formulated in a series of questions: Is your writing

1. Complete?

- (a) Does it give all necessary information?

- (b) Does it answer all questions the reader may raise?

2. Concise?

- (a) Does it contain only essential facts?

- (b) Does it include only essential words and phrases?

3. Clear?

- (a) Is the language adapted to the readers; are the words the simplest that carry the thought?

- (b) Do the words exactly express the thought?

- (c) Is the sentence structure clear?

- (d) Does each paragraph contain only one main idea?

(e) Are these ideas presented in the best order?

4. Correct?

(a) Is the information accurate?

(b) Do the statements conform with policy?

(c) Is the writing free from crudities of grammar, spelling, punctuation?

5. Appropriate in Tone?

(a) Will the tone bring the desired response?

(b) Is the writing free from words that may arouse antagonism?

(c) Is it free from stilted, hackneyed, or legalistic phrases?

The Soil Conservation pamphlet asks the bureau employee these questions:

1. Do you write to yourself when you are supposed to be writing a publication or memorandum for other people to read? Do you assume that other people will understand what you are writing just because you understand it?

2. Do you write for your professional colleagues or your superiors instead of to your intended reader audience? A lot of nonprofessional writers do. Do you try to write each sentence so that it will be bullet-proof against the adverse criticism of some antagonistic colleague? Many people do that very thing when actually they are supposed to be writing for a farmer a simple explanation about what to do or how to do something. Do you try to impress your colleagues or superiors with your knowledge of the subject you are writing about?

3. Do you try to hedge on every point you make in your writing?

4. Do you start writing before you figure out exactly what you want to say?

5. Do you try to explain technical matters that are beyond the comprehension of your readers?

6. Do you try to save space by crowding several thoughts or ideas into one sentence?

7. Are you one of the people that think all government publications should be strictly impersonal? Do you consider it beneath your dignity to address your writing to your audience? Do you try to avoid the use of personal pronouns? What do you gain by writing "it is advisable to . . ." instead of "you should . . .?"

8. Do you try to follow the style of other government publications in your writing?

I should like, now, to consider a final question, namely that assigned to the speakers at this session: What can English teachers do in the way of training their students in writing and speaking for work in the Government? In answering this question, I wish to say at the outset that training in English is regarded as very important for Government service, for an elementary knowledge of grammar is basic to effective work even in specialized fields of activity. Employees should know how words are written, how they are to be understood, and how they are to be arranged in sentences. The nature of their job will, of course, determine how much knowledge they must have about grammar, and its various parts such as semantics and syntax. Perhaps I can indicate how much they should know by referring to Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. In discussing the split infinitive, Fowler divides the English-speaking world into (1) those who neither know nor care what a split infinitive is; (2) those who do not know, but care very much; (3) those who know and condemn; (4) those who know and approve; and (5) those who know and distinguish. In Government service, employees doing clerical and manual work need neither know nor care very much about grammar; and they become difficult to deal with when they have only a smattering of grammar, so that they do not know,

but care very much. Employees doing professional and scientific work ought to know grammar but need not concern themselves with its niceties. Only the small core of specially trained writers ought to know and to be able to distinguish. They ought actually to be educated to the point where they can understand and appreciate Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*.

The question that is under discussion at this session seems to imply that there are deficiencies in the training that has been given in the past. But my answer carries no such implication. On the whole I think that the colleges have been doing a good job of training people for Government employment, and as I see it, no changes of curriculum or of emphasis would greatly improve this training. Courses in "ghostwriting," such as have been established in a university in Washington, are not needed. I believe the new employees in the National Archives are typical of the product of our educational system. They have to have a college degree to pass the Civil Service Commission's verbal aptitude test. Most of them are able to spell and punctuate acceptably, know at least the rudiments of grammar, and have vocabularies adequate for our purpose. For the most part the glaring errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation arise from thoughtlessness rather than miseducation. And if employees have not been properly trained in English, our editors and supervisors can revise their written products before they are published.

The suggestions that I would make call for no change but for the injection into the curriculum of certain extra admonitions, hardly more than that, for those students who have in mind to enter the Government service. My concern and the concern of most Government officials, I believe, is rather with the attitude of our college trained employees to-

ward the task of writing. It is in the development of sound and proper attitudes toward this task that I think the teachers of English can be of most assistance to us.

What we should like if it were possible would be to have employees come to us with an attitude that facilitates continued improvement in writing—an attitude that recognizes that no writer ever writes perfectly, that the best writers write badly when they don't take pains, that every writer can improve his skill until his mind begins to fail, that the product of our first fine frenzy seldom has anything to commend it except its frenzy. We should like them to regard the job of writing as one of the major parts of every assignment they undertake. In estimating time for the completion of a job, they should combat the tendency to suppose that when material has been studied and notes taken, the job is virtually done and that all that remains is to "throw their notes together" and "write them up." One of our commonest failings is to allow no time for studying the problem of how best to present our conclusions or for the tedious process of reorganizing, rephrasing, and redrafting.

I should like to see ready developed in all our new employees the habit of self-criticism with respect to writing and a readiness to accept in good spirit any criticism of their writing offered by others. They should appreciate the labor of an editor who works over a piece they have written before it is released to the intended reader; and they should see that while the points of criticism may be matters of judgment and opinion, the editor's judgment is more dependable than their own since he is in a position more nearly analogous to that of the reader and can apply the test of whether the thought has got across. Their initial pride of authorship should not make

them stiff-necked against suggested changes; and they must not become so attached to a sentence, paragraph, or chapter that they cannot coolly see it altered or thrown out.

Finally, I should like to see them reconciled to the inescapable conditions that are attached to Government service, which I have reviewed for you. These are that the writing of an individual is submerged in that of his office, that it is reviewed for content as well as for grammar, and that it will appear anonymously. The effect of these conditions, I noted, is that the Government provides little opportunity for self-expression. There

will be no occasion to write jocularly, allusively, ironically, or poetically. All that will be required of the employee who enters Government service is that he must be able to write a sober prose, in simple language, and in a style that is candid, direct, and pointed. But these conditions are not so disadvantageous to the writer as they may seem; for a by-line is less frequently the symbol of credit than of blame. It is good to be paid for producing our little monsters of bad English without having to suffer the penalty of avowing forever our parenthood. Salaried oblivion is not an unhappy fate.

The Importance of Communication For Advancement in Industry¹

W. K. BAILEY²

The general subject this morning is "What do Employers Expect of Freshman Courses in Composition and Communication?" But I would prefer to talk on the subject of what capabilities will be most helpful to an individual in obtaining the advancement in an organization which he and we hope he will quickly obtain.

We want and need people who can think—who have had some training in thinking—who can distinguish between cause and effect both in the concrete and in the abstract, and who can so express their conclusions that they are accepted by others, and so that others will follow their leadership.

The first part of that statement is your most important objective. Without it the second half means nothing. However, I

believe, you can give a good deal of guidance along the lines of how things should be expressed, and can thus add some vocational education to the general education which is your main objective.

I want to make it very clear that I am not in favor of substituting vocational education with its benefits for the benefits of general education.

It is my observation that, in business, the oral presentations are much better than the usual written presentations. This is probably the result of the individual's boss starting the presentation by asking a direct question, and as a result a correct answer is given, followed by as much supplementary data as is necessary.

However, the usual procedure in written presentations is to present all of the data and then bury the conclusions at some point near the end of the written communication.

As an illustration, I will cite the case

¹ Notes on a talk at the spring meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Cleveland, Ohio, March 28, 1952.

² Vice-President, Manufacturing, The Warner and Swasey Company, Cleveland.

of one of our college graduates who was asked to make a survey in our area and report his recommendations as to how we should pay for overtime work performed by certain people in our organization.

I was present when the report was made verbally, and in response to the direct question as to what we should do, a very clearcut statement was made, followed by a clear summary of existing conditions in our area.

However, if when this report was ready, the man who had asked for it had not had time to discuss the matter, he would have received a written report which clearly stated how the survey was made, the complete detail obtained in the survey, and, at the end of the second page, a statement of conclusions.

Before writing the report, why shouldn't the individual definitely decide the question to be answered, and answer it, and then give the supporting data. I do not mean that the supporting data is not important, and I do not mean that it should not be presented, and perhaps it should be presented in great detail, but this does not prevent the presenting of the conclusions first.

Very often a report or an instruction, or a letter, is written without having decided what it is supposed to do.

Is it supposed to give information?

Is it supposed to give opinions?

Is it to report what has been done?

Is it to report why something was done?

Is it to report something that should be done?

Is it to get people to do something?

Is it to keep people from doing something?

The purpose of the communication will, of course, affect the method of presentation, and the report or instruction will be more effective.

From the standpoint of composition,

there is an art to presentation—particularly, an art to stripping away the chaff and extraneous material which seems to be so easy to write. I don't know how such a man would rate in literature, but one of the finest business arts is to be able to sum up a discussion in one sentence.

A good many years ago Mr. Knudsen, when he was in charge of Chevrolet Manufacturing, made one of the finest sales talks to the Chevrolet organization that have ever been made. Mr. Knudsen was asked to tell the sales organization what he wanted. I am inclined to think that he had written quite a speech, but when he got up in front of the organization, he forgot his speech. He held up one finger of each hand and said, "Just give me one for one." That expressed the entire aim of the Chevrolet organization at that time, when they were trying to equal the Ford Motor Company sales.

I have here one of the most important business books that have been written. It is entitled *The Principles of Organization* by James D. Mooney, and I want to read a quotation from the Bible that Mr. Mooney placed on the fly leaf.

"And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. And they judged the people at all seasons: the hard causes they brought unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves."

—Exodus XVIII: 25,26.

Mr. Mooney, or someone, recognized that that simple statement covered the entire subject matter of his book. I do not mean that the book would not need to be written, and it certainly should be read, but I can assure you that it is very hard reading as compared with that first simple statement. And while I do not know Mr. Mooney, I have a definite feel-

ing that Mr. Mooney did not write in the same manner that he would have expressed himself if he were talking with you here today. I do not believe that he would have said: "By the term 'functionalism' we mean the distinction between kinds of duties. Thus, it is clearly distinguished from the scalar principle." I believe he would have reduced it to simpler language and there are many indications in the book that he could do so.

For example, I would like to quote the following: "The objective of industry may be defined as profit through service; that of warfare as the military defeat of an enemy; that of religion as the welfare of the soul. It is only when we advance to the doctrine of procedure that complexity may appear."

In addition to the difficulty in developing the ability to express complex situations in simple terms, there is also the difficulty of developing an art in the use of words. And I know that you, of the teaching profession, can help students in this art. Most communications are written with the idea of getting somebody to do something, and while the use of individual words is important, there is a principle of presentation that is even more important.

Why do we continuously use the negative statement so exclusively until we have been trained to do otherwise? There is nothing new about this. We all know the story of a mother who told her little boy not to put beans up his nose, and how she was amazed to find that that's where they went.

It is so much more effective to tell people what we want them to do instead of telling them what we don't want them to do, and everybody is so much happier

when they are told to do something than when they are told not to do something. For example, I recently reviewed a booklet on our Suggestion System, and I found this statement, "Suggestions cannot be accepted for awards from foremen about matters in their own department." Now there is no problem with the foremen on this subject. They understand that they are paid to run their departments and to put into effect the things which should be done, and that this is part of their compensation. But wouldn't it be better to change the statement to say that suggestions from foremen are acceptable for awards on all matters except those pertaining to their departments.

Some years ago, there was a very popular song which I think might become the theme song for writers of communications. It was entitled, "Accentuate the Positive and Eliminate the Negative." With practice, any negative statement can be changed to a positive statement without a difference in meaning. But the difference in results may be the difference between getting something done or not getting something done.

In your work with these students whom we are going to hire some day, I would suggest that you emphasize to them three questions, and that they decide the answers before they write anything. These questions are:

1. Why are they writing anything?
2. What do they want to accomplish?
3. How should it be said to get the desired result as quickly as possible and as easily as possible?

The man who can influence people will succeed in any organization. What he says and how he says it is all important.

The Indiana University Program of Training For Teaching College Composition

PHILIP R. WIKELUND¹

In recent years considerable criticism of the teaching in institutions of higher learning has been voiced from several quarters, the most notable, perhaps, being that of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Far from turning a deaf ear to these strictures, the colleges and universities have proceeded to an earnest self-examination, and their faculties, through their professional organizations and in their own administrative bodies, have become increasingly concerned with the improvement of teaching.² One expression of this concern is the already extensive and constantly growing attention paid to the training of the college and university teacher. Undoubtedly the greatest development of actual training programs has taken place in university departments with heavy enrollments in multiple section courses on the freshman level, staffed very largely—sometimes almost wholly—by graduate-student teachers, whose numbers and inexperience urgently prescribe some kind of guidance. This need for training is especially great in departments of English since they

must furnish instruction in that almost universal requirement—Freshman English. This article does not intend to survey such programs or to engage in polemics on their procedures or philosophies;³ it mentions these facts merely by way of foreword to the description of a particular training program, now in effect for three years, in the Department of English at Indiana University.

From the beginning this program was regarded as plastic and experimental; it has already undergone considerable change within the three years and is sure to be modified further. When first established it involved two distinct features: a system of counseling and class visitation of the graduate-student teachers by seasoned members of the full-time staff, and a graduate course entitled Proseminar in the Teaching of College English Composition. It was hoped that the graduate-student teacher would gain valuable criticism, practical classroom wisdom, and realistic encouragement from his association with a mature and experienced teacher, and that this relationship—that of older and younger colleagues—would be rewarding on both sides. At that time, however, this part of the program proved impracticable, and its function was largely absorbed into the proseminar. As originally conceived, the proseminar endeavored to afford a broad professional training for the graduate student, who almost certainly will teach one or more sections of Freshman English in his first post. Consequently it aimed at more than explication of the use of required texts, indoctrination in departmental syllabi and university regulations, or the anatomy and

¹ Indiana University

² Among these might be noted the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the American Association of University Professors; nor should the significance of the Ford Faculty Fellows be overlooked. In the field of English, the College English Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, College Section, and the Conference on College Composition and Communication have shown unusual interest in this problem.

³ For a detailed account, see Harold B. Allen, "Preparing the Teacher of Composition and Communication—A Report," *College Composition and Communication*, III (May, 1952), 3-13; and Edward Foster, "Who Teaches Teaching? A Preliminary Report on Courses and Apprenticeships in the Teaching of College English," a report of the College English Association, December 12, 1952 (mimeographed).

arbitrament of day-to-day classroom problems; not that these matters were ignored, but they were usually taken up in a broader context and against a theoretical background. The earlier syllabus of the course makes clear its character: it purposed "(1) to acquaint the graduate-student teacher of composition with his professional status and responsibilities; (2) to inform him regarding the history, philosophy, and methods of his field of teaching and its relationship to the work of the whole university; (3) to familiarize him with the student's high school instructional background in composition; (4) to inform him of the main sources of information in his professional field; (5) to train him to meet routine and special problems in the teaching of college composition." Because of its broad professional emphasis, the proseminar was open to all graduate students in the university, and during its first two years students from foreign countries and from the School of Education enrolled; but their special interests were not easily served by the course and always constituted an unwieldy, alien element.

Today the proseminar is strictly a practical, intensive, in-service training program restricted to those graduate-student members of its composition staff who lack the requisite experience. About fifteen students are enrolled each fall for one semester; the proseminar meets for two hours once a week and carries at present three hours graduate credit. The director of composition is in charge. The seminar mode of instruction has been retained because it encourages the graduate-student teacher to bring up his problems and air his views and to have them thoroughly discussed and threshed out. Although in the first few meetings it is necessary to spend some part of the time on matters of mere official information about the composition course, prac-

tically at once the problems of teaching are intensely discussed and continue to be the focus of the work of the proseminar. In the latter part of the semester these discussions are more formally organized around papers presented by each graduate-student teacher on a topic which interests him. This part of the course will be described more fully later on; it is, in essence, a necessary concession to academic convention since the course confers credit.

The work of the proseminar is arranged to parallel as closely as possible the program of the elementary composition course, and to meet the problems of the graduate-student teacher as they arise. The earlier meetings of the proseminar are devoted to the need of the novitiate teacher for basic information about the composition course he teaches: its aims, procedures, materials. First, the syllabi for the whole composition program at Indiana University—involving four courses—are carefully reviewed so that the teacher sees his work in relation to the rest of the program, but the syllabus for his own course (he is regularly assigned the first semester course) is studied in detail and its special features discussed. Next, the teacher must familiarize himself thoroughly with the course texts, which are analyzed in relation to the syllabus. Finally, certain materials, such as the Faculty Handbook, the University catalog, and the brochure distributed to students, "Your Work in Composition," are examined on those points which concern the teacher: regulations governing attendance, the reporting of absences and grades, rules on the relations of faculty and students, the varying requirements in composition of the different divisions of the university, the interpretation and use made in the composition program of the freshman orientation tests, the exemption and pro-

iciency examinations in composition, and the handling of plagiarism.

Usually fairly early in the term, and of course whenever it seems relevant, the graduate-student teacher is furnished with special kinds of information. He is informed of the numerous counseling and personal services which exist in the university for the assistance of his students, including that peculiar institution, "tutoring," most taken advantage of by physical education majors. He receives a copy of a survey, made a few years ago by the department, of the Indiana freshman's high school preparation for composition. The procedures of mid-term and monthly veterans' reports are explained. He is instructed in the importance and manner of making liaison arrangements with the University Library whenever his assignments involve the use of reading materials held there. The organization of the composition program and his administrative duties in connection with it, such as keeping the departmental class records to be filed in the English Office, are described. And finally the proseminar considers such matters as the nature of academic freedom—for both teacher *and* student, professional ethics, and the treatment of certain controversial and socially charged topics.

Thereafter the proseminar tackles the real job of planning the day-to-day schedule of theme assignments and classroom instruction, with all their attendant problems. At this point it becomes impossible to maintain any close chronological correlation between the teaching of the graduate student and the work of the proseminar as a group, for each composition teacher meets daily a different combination of problems and meets them in his individual way. Accordingly this part of the work is handled on an individual basis between the director and the graduate-student teach-

er, who is asked to draw up a teaching plan for a period of five weeks, showing his class assignments in synoptic form. He has already been provided with a number of suggestive teaching plans by members of the staff who have taught the course for several years. He is requested to include reading assignments, theme topics and requirements, and the nature of the classroom discussion. These specifications are necessary since the departmental syllabus does not dictate a fixed order or detailed treatment of the elements of the course. The following excerpt from one teaching plan (classes meet for one hour twice a week) is illustrative:

TUES. Library exercise due.

Discuss with the class the importance of the library as the central focus of their education, and the importance of skill in its use. Hand out mimeographed copies of Mark Van Doren's "Education by Books." Read through it and allow time for some discussion of its thesis. Analyze the structure of this essay, putting special emphasis on the paragraphs as parts of the unified whole.

For Thurs.: Read Kirschbaum, *Clear Writing*, pp. 242-249 (Revision); Hodges, *Harbrace College Handbook*, pp. 326-354 (The Paragraph).

THURS. Using the best theme from the previous assignment as a basis, actually go through a complete revision process in class. Emphasize the paragraph as a unit and the principles of sound organization.

For Tues.: A complete revision of the previous theme will be due. All material used in the process to be handed in—explain that this revision is a separate theme with its own grade, etc.

At later intervals, teaching plans for the second and the final five-week periods of the composition course are re-

quired. The director reads these teaching plans and critically annotates them for the individual teacher, but he also brings any general characteristics to the attention of the proseminar for purposes of discussion. By this means the proseminar can profitably deal with problems of scope and emphasis, as well as minor points of technique. Inevitably, the plans are departed from somewhat in practice; this is to be expected, for the test is actual teaching. They will have served their end, however, if they have clarified and sharpened the teacher's thinking about his teaching. Moreover, the changes are usually talked over and provide further occasion for instruction.

At the heart of the work in composition stands the student theme, and the focus of the proseminar is fixed steadily on the problems connected with the assignment, marking and grading, correction and revision, and classroom analysis of themes. Theme assignments—topics, length, number, and so on—are of course handled in the teaching plans. Lists of the theme topics assigned by each individual instructor over a five-week period are mimeographed and distributed among members of the proseminar for their information and as a basis for discussion of that subject. But more important is the actual grading, marking, and critical dissection of mimeographed student themes which occur at practically every meeting of the proseminar. The members read the theme over carefully and mark it for their own guidance. Then the grade assigned the theme by each member (including the director) is posted on the blackboard. The range of grades is noted, and several members of the proseminar are called upon in turn to criticize the theme and to state their grounds for the grade given. General discussion usually ensues, after which the director may evaluate the criticism and comment on the various criteria of

grading. In this way the whole matter of standards is inductively handled. Another procedure is to have each graduate-student teacher turn in early in the term two themes which he has graded "A" or "B," two graded "C," and two graded "D" or "F"; on these the director makes brief informal comments. Later, an entire set of themes for a particular assignment is requested from each teacher. The director scrutinizes these minutely, keeping notes on the teacher's comments, points stressed, grades, etc., and his own general impressions. He then holds a conference, an hour or longer, with the teacher, and they talk over the themes. This procedure, it should be stressed, does not aim at supervision but at drawing out the bases of the teacher's judgment. One other method of reviewing theme marking is to have the graduate-student teachers read and mark a mimeographed theme outside the proseminar, supplying the usual terminal comment; these comments are then mimeographed together and discussed at a session of the proseminar.

The use of themes for classroom instruction also receives major attention. The proseminar surveys the advantages and disadvantages of different methods of reproduction, in part or whole—reading themes by instructor or student, mimeographing, the opaque projector; the graduate-student teachers are regularly "checked out" in the operation of the latter. The proseminar compares the use of handbook and other exercises with the use of student themes as material for classroom instruction. The perennial question of how far students should be required to rewrite their themes—whether any corrections should be made, all corrections, or total revision, as well as the best times and methods to carry this out—is dealt with. As regards grades, the use of so-called "split" grades and the practice of psychological up-grading are

discussed, as is the principle of not assigning or at least revealing early grades, with the aim of concentrating attention on the writing and its improvement.

Certain other aspects of instruction receive special prominence. The handling of conferences is carefully reviewed. Assignments in the use of the dictionary and indoctrination in the resources and procedures of the University Library are part of the composition syllabus; on these the director offers advice and suggestions, particularly regarding the latter since it necessitates close cooperation with the library staff. The necessity of a workable philosophy of language is emphasized in connection with the teaching of grammar and usage. Ideally, perhaps, all teachers of composition should have training in the history of the language and in modern English. In the proseminar all that can be attempted is to consider the practical problems of the instructor, who must deal with the special characteristics of written English, to glance at the traditional and "liberal" attitudes on the teaching of grammar, and to indicate, impartially, the pedagogical implications of modern linguistics. In regard to the teaching of punctuation, the "functional" approach is contrasted with the "mark-by-mark" method; and the pedagogical advantages are pointed out of tying together the work in sentence structure and punctuation. The role of clear thinking and effective organization in the student's writing, including the proper use of outlines, is naturally under constant consideration.

Many minor pedagogical points are taken up in the course of these discussions, such as the significance of context in matters of usage, diction, punctuation, and sentence structure; the problem of securing lively student participation in the classroom and avoiding the "lecture"; the importance of concentrat-

ing on major essentials in the writing of students rather than pedantic concern with puristic shibboleths. The graduate-student teachers are encouraged to experiment, to bring their imaginations into play, and to make the work in composition as intellectually challenging as possible; and to use the proseminar as a clearing house of ideas.

No texts are used in the proseminar. Instead, mimeographed bibliographies on such subjects as grammar and usage, punctuation, spelling, sentence structure, logic in composition, academic freedom, reading materials, and linguistics are given out. Certain items are required reading and are available in a reserve shelf set up in the Graduate English Seminar Room; others are included for the use of the teacher whenever he feels the need for further information. In this way he is introduced to the principal journals publishing articles in this field. He also has easy access to an excellent composition library housed in the department offices. For its obvious advantages, George O. Curme's *Principles and Practice of English Grammar* in the College Outline Series is the one required purchase, but the graduate-student teacher is strongly urged to build up a small personal library of professional materials.

The most formalized part of the proseminar is the report submitted by each graduate-student teacher in the latter part of the term. It may be an analysis of a particular teaching problem, an account of a teaching experiment, or a critical survey of a special approach or philosophy in the teaching of composition. Typical subjects are: Some Problems Arising in Connection with an Exceptional Student, An Experiment in the Teaching of Technical Description, The Function of Logic in Composition, The Place of Readings in the Composition Syllabus, Problems Connected with

Teaching "Functional" Grammar, and The Difficulties of Students with Various Types of "Personal" Subjects. The reports are presented orally to the proseminar in abridged form (fifteen to twenty minutes) and then questions and comments are invited; these usually last much longer. The reports must be submitted in finished written form by the end of the term for final reading by the director.

The writer would like at this point to speak in the first person. I am inclined to believe that the graduate-student teacher, in all his greenness, is sometimes just as successful as the old hands, for against his inexperience he brings ardor and freshness and flexibility. But I am also convinced, out of my own earlier experience and my observance of young teachers, that he can profit from timely guidance and suggestion, that there is much value in his having a forum in which to air his ideas on teaching and

test them against those of his peers and "elders," and that the special difficulties faced by those who teach the modern freshman dictate some kind of training. Let me hasten to say I do not think this training need be formally conducted: I have known a group of young instructors who, over coffee or beer, gave themselves intensive training through their keen and persistent concern about their own teaching and their mutual problems; and the most effective training I am familiar with takes place in a certain science department, whose graduate students meet informally in the homes of the professors to discuss problems of teaching in their field. I am further persuaded that this training is most profitable when associated with actual teaching, either before or after the completion of graduate study. And finally I feel most strongly that this training belongs unquestionably in the academic department in which this teaching is or will be done: it should not be the province of the general educationist.

Teaching Critical Reading With Instructional Tests¹

PAUL B. DIEDERICH²

In speaking of my subject I shall confine myself to a brief experiment in teaching critical reading by the use of tests as homework, followed by class discussion of the items on which the students disagreed.

The experiment came about almost accidentally. During the last war I had to supervise the construction of a long series of English tests for the United States Armed Forces Institute. We departed radically from the usual pattern of objective English tests, in which no sentence or passage has any connection with any other. Each examination dealt with

a single topic. One, for example, dealt with the possibilities of and the dangers in cooperative housing. Another con-

¹ The report given here is an abbreviated form of a paper, "How Can We Best Teach and Test Critical Reading?" given by Mr. Diederich at the CCCC luncheon on November 28, 1952, during the NCTE annual meeting in Boston. The discussion which followed—by a panel consisting of Thomas F. Dunn, Drake University, Moderator; Newman B. Birk, Tufts College; William C. Hummel, Kansas State College; J. Hooper Wise, University of Florida; with others participating from the audience—was lively and protracted, and is much abbreviated here. The condensation of Mr. Diederich's paper and of the discussion was done by the recorder at the meeting, William M. Gibson, New York University.

² Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

trasted the treatment of old people in China and in the United States. A third examined the likenesses and differences in two passages on friendship by Bacon and Emerson.

Each topic was usually treated in two or more passages of moderate length, expressing contrasting points of view, and often written in different forms or periods. We then wrote between forty and sixty questions on these passages with one good answer for each question and three other answers that we considered less good. Students were to mark the best answer to each question.

We then selected one or more complete papers written by our students on the topic of the reading passages, usually based on these same passages, comparing and contrasting their points of view and then stating and defending the student's own position. At that time we printed the student papers in the left-hand column of a divided page with certain portions underlined and numbered. Opposite each marked portion, in the column at the right, we suggested four ways of writing, arranging, or punctuating it: first, the one the student had used, then three others that might be better or worse. Again they were to mark the best among these four possibilities.

As we made up the series of tests for the Armed Forces, we were obliged by our contract to try them out in representative schools and colleges in the east, west, north, and south. The result was an unexpected flood of "fan-mail." Teachers wrote in asking whether we had any more tests like these. They said that students found them interesting and worth while, and that it was impossible to choke off class discussion afterwards. All the teacher had to do was referee.

We could not satisfy this demand at the time because most of the tests were for military use only, but by the end of the war we had enough tests left over

to begin experimenting with their possible use as instructional materials. At the same time I was made head of the remedial English program in the College of the University of Chicago. Since nothing else could happen to these students in the way of English instruction that was worse than what had already happened, my assistant and I were authorized to go ahead and try out our tests.

We had three class meetings per week and as many as twenty-seven students in one class, although we tried to hold remedial groups to not more than fifteen. For the first meeting of the week students prepared the reading exercise as homework. Here arose our first pedagogical problem. They could answer between forty and sixty of our questions in one hour of homework, but we found that we could not get more than eight or ten questions adequately discussed in a class hour. Hence the problem was to reduce the sixty to the ten that most needed discussion. Discarding the idea of first scoring the tests to determine the questions on which there was most disagreement and then holding discussion on them in the class following, we invented a gadget that saved a great deal of trouble and added an element of sporting interest to the class. We had cards printed with large black letters A and E on one side and I and O on the other. These were the letters of our four answers to each question.

All I did when students came to that first meeting of the week was to exchange a few facetious comments on how hard the test had been and then say, "Well, what did you do with Item 1?" Each student would hold up the letter of the response he had given. If there was a great shining sea of A's, and A was the best answer, I would simply say, "Yes, A," and pass on without comment. But if one faction wanted A and another E, I would not say which I

thought was right. Instead, I would ask, "Why did you pick A?" and the student would try to formulate his reasons. Then I would turn to another and say, "Why did you pick E?" By this time hands would be waving; and other students would point out what was wrong with the arguments so far and add arguments of their own. In so far as I could control my natural instincts, I tried to tell them as little as possible. Whenever I broke down and simply told them the right answer and why, they promptly forgot it. But if they figured it out for themselves, they would keep referring to that case as a precedent when similar problems were encountered later in the course. Principles of learning and of teaching are plainly involved here.

In the second meeting of the week we discussed the writing exercise in this same fashion. If you ask why I include a writing exercise in a discussion of critical reading, my first answer is that the more precisely I investigate students' skill in both, the less difference I find between them. My second answer is that the writing exercise is precisely what our topic names: it is a test of critical reading of a student paper. I really prefer the term "analytical reading" when this skill is applied to good writing.

In the third meeting of the week, students brought in a paper of their own on the topic of the reading and writing exercises and we discussed the problems they had faced in writing it. Some of the papers were read aloud. Then I might comment on some of the most obnoxious faults I had observed in their writing of the preceding week and give them a bit of drill to fix the relevant principles in mind.

In general, I should not like to use a three-part exercise of this sort more than once a month in a regular class. In the rest of the time I should want students to be discussing longer works, literary

forms, problems of organization, argument, style, and the like. But once in a while I should like to concentrate on an exercise of limited scope with a series of problems of interpretation or of expression for the students to solve. The theory, if there is one, behind this preference is that students at this stage of development are making hundreds of decisions of which they are unaware whenever they read anything or write anything. These decisions must be automatic and unconscious if they are to be efficient, but students who fall down badly on tests are making far too many of these decisions on false bases. Then it is time to haul these decisions up to the light of day to find out what makes one interpretation of a passage better than another, or one way of expressing an idea better than another. They need for a time to become conscious of the clues to which they have been responding unconsciously, and to become aware of the relative validity of these clues in varying contexts. I hesitate to claim that "the best" way for students to do this is to argue with one another over their responses to well-conceived test items. It is certainly a good way. It is stimulating, and I have some evidence that it is worth while. My first group of seventy students to finish my remedial course failed 31 comprehensive examinations in their first year in college. A control group with equal initial scores in reading, writing, and verbal intelligence, but without the remedial course, failed 54.

Thirty-one as against fifty-four failures. All the rest of their program was identical. It looked as though the remedial program had not only taught these students to read better but had increased their ability to learn whatever the college had to teach.

- - - - -

In the panel discussion of Mr. Diehrich's paper which followed, Mr. Wil-

liam C. Hummel urged the view that writing difficulties are closely allied to reading problems. Argumentative classroom discussions, on a moving-picture for example, become for his students good subjects for theme writing. Mr. Newman B. Birk, noting that critical reading of the kind proposed by Mr. Diederich would take only a part of the course time, proposed that this kind of critical reading should be extended to literature, and raised the objection that Mr. Diederich's tests would not test skill in reading longer pieces. He urged the importance of such a skill, and of the student's gearing his reading speed to the kind of writing he is faced with. Mr. J. Hooper Wise spoke of reading for the central idea, and the value of class discussion of various precis of a given piece of writing to determine which is best

and in what respects the others are inadequate.

Mr. Thomas F. Dunn asked if esthetic judgements might not be tested and literature taught by such examinations as Mr. Diederich's. Mr. Diederich suggested tentatively for this purpose such questions as (1) choosing between good and less good readings for the effectiveness of a metaphor in context, (2) differentiating between elevated and flat passages from Shakespeare, (3) choosing a short poem by a given author, after previous study of that author, from a group of poems by others.

Mr. Diederich concluded by explaining that a reading test is most reliable when students' grades can be checked against grades given them earlier by good teachers for work covering a full year.

The Teaching of Style

NORMAN NATHAN¹

"... our style bewrays us," is the way Thomas Burton phrased a familiar concept. In an attempt to bring home to the student what his writing tendency is like (and perhaps what he is like), I use the following device.

At the beginning of the hour I hand out mimeographed sheets which state:

With each of the following groups, write one sentence that contains all of the words. Additional words may be added if needed.

1. police, woman, red, lost, hand-bag
2. spring, man, hat, soft, new
3. pretty, flower, girl, dress, pink, plain

I give no verbal instructions and refuse to answer questions lest by so doing I disclose my purpose or create an extran-

eous reaction in the mind of the questioner.

Within five minutes all have completed the assignment. Then I proceed to have each one in turn read his first sentence aloud. The suspense that has been aroused is now seasoned with humor as different personalities respond to the above words in unexpected ways. I ask the students if any of them has a sentence exactly like anyone else's. In a class of twenty-five I have never found more than three identical sentences and often there is no duplication.

Then I inquire as to what this suggests. For one thing, the class begins to realize that a teacher cannot receive two uncopied themes that are alike. Another point that becomes obvious is the great variety of expression possible in stating even the simplest idea. Most students are willing to admit after this that it is with-

¹ Utica College of Syracuse University, Utica, New York.

in their scope to write about an ordinary happening in a way that is new and different.

My next step is to ask someone to read his three sentences to the class. I then pose the major problem. Does this man show a tendency towards a particular sentence pattern? How may he adjust this tendency to secure better sentence patterns?

If I have been careful to select a student whose initial sentence indicated that whatever he wrote would be likely to display marked individuality, the class will find it easy to discover a common denominator in all of his sentences.

Among the points which are brought out are: the presence or absence of originality; the brevity or length of the writing; the quality of the prose rhythm, if any; the use of involved or of simple grammatical structure; the choice of objectivity or subjectivity in approach; the use of periodic or suspenseful phraseology; the presence or absence of variety in sentence patterns.

All of these items can be commented upon by students, and methods can be suggested whereby a student can improve his composition by analysis of the sentences within a given paragraph. That this problem is complex but solvable can be brought out by reading the results of two students who are found to write short, simple sentences. A count shows that both have used twenty-eight words to complete the three groups. Student A reads:

1. The woman lost her red handbag and called the police.
2. The man bought a soft, new, spring hat.
3. The pretty flower girl was wearing a plain pink dress.

Student B gives us:

1. The policewoman lost her red handbag.

2. A man lost his new, soft-looking felt hat by a spring.

3. A girl wearing a plain dress picked a pretty pink flower.

It does not take a Coleridge or a Brooks-and-Warren to tell the two groups apart or to indicate paths to improvement.

While a student's exact capacity for managing an English sentence is not revealed by this exercise, the majority of the class will give ample evidence that when a man begins to write he ordinarily tends to bring in his own peculiarities in sentence patterns. A few of the students, of course, will show little of an obvious trend.

Someone may object that the student who has produced three sentences in similar patterns may, with proper care, display as much variety in a composition as the one who naturally varies his structure. It is then that the value of analyzing one's first draft becomes apparent. A student can discover his normal tendencies and learn what to avoid and what to develop. Many have come to me after class to announce that they have seen the light. "Now I know what's the matter with me," one student told me. "I write too much." His group of three was:

1. A woman lost a red handbag, she asked a policeman to help her look for it.
2. A man should buy a new soft hat for spring, it will make him feel better.
3. A girl bought two dresses, one dress was plain the other had a large pink flower as the main design.

Run-ons had never impressed him. But now he could see that his treatment was obviously inferior to that of others.

Personalities can appear in groups such as these. I presume a cynic wrote:

1. The woman who lost her red

- handbag complained to the police that it was stolen.
2. That man over there with the new spring hat is a soft touch for a loan.
 3. I'd rather give this flower to the pretty girl with the pink dress over there than to the plain one.

Note the hopeful aspect this student has managed to add:

1. The police found the red handbag that the woman had lost.
2. In spring a man likes to wear a soft new hat.
3. The pretty girl in the plain pink dress sold a flower.

It is needless to here multiply (am I betraying my style!) examples of the sentences I have received. The point is that the project, aside from keeping the class interested and amused, has many helpful and informative qualities. My experience convinces me that at least two or three individuals benefit greatly from the class hour. And if in every period but two or three did benefit significantly, how wonderfully successful education would be.

The groups of words I have tried (after discarding several others) are purely exploratory. No doubt many who use the idea will find combinations likely to be more effective. Perhaps five or six sentences would produce a more obvious trend. Nevertheless, if the teacher wishes to get the most out of the class' discussion, he had best know what to expect from the words given. I have noticed, for example, that those who are brief will be able to do the above assignment in fewer than thirty words. Fifty may not suffice for the long-winded.

Statistically speaking, I have found that for group one over seventy percent will use "red handbag" and only a smattering will write "policewoman," "red hair," or "found."

"Spring," in the second group, is almost invariably treated as a season. About half will "buy" the hat; one fifth will "wear" it. This contrasts with group three in which over two thirds have the girl wearing the dress and only a few write of her buying it. In fact, the last sentence stares at you as, "The pretty flower girl wore a plain pink dress." Yet fewer than half use "plain pink dress" and only one fourth write "pretty flower girl." Apparently, we see just what we want or are accustomed to see.

A quarter of my students start each sentence with a different word, while a larger group begin all three sentences with "a" or "the." Those students who come off best in class criticism are usually the ones who vary their structure and rhythms. If this exercise did nothing else, it would pin point the value of variety of pattern and indicate that style does not mean too much of the same thing.

In over one half of the sentences extra ideas, not needed to complete the thought, will be added. Descriptive adjectives, such as "young," "old," "attractive," are brought in despite the final qualification of the instruction, "Additional words may be added if needed." Following instructions seems, for most students, unlikely to abort the individual's style. Or, is "if needed" sufficiently vague so that each may interpret the phrase according to his personal inclinations?

A Why and How For Freshman Composition

GEORGE D. STOUT¹

The English teacher—like the enlightened administrator—does not need to be told that Freshman Composition is one of the most important courses in the college curriculum. But engrossed as he is in the necessity for the rigorous application of forms and rules, he sometimes finds it difficult to guard, even in the back of his mind, the idea that he is shaping the general education of his students. As an aid to myself in that very situation I have outlined the course in somewhat different terms from those usually employed; in the hope that it may be of use to others I venture to present that outline here.

The first phase, occupying the first six weeks or so of the first semester, is the indoctrination of the student with the idea that language, whether spoken or written, is not an end in itself; that it is rather a medium of communicating information, ideas, emotions, and images from the mind of the writer or speaker to the mind of the reader or hearer. To most of our freshmen this is an almost entirely new idea. Their previous training in composition, if any, has largely ingrained in them the habit of running to "look something up" when they are faced with the necessity of producing a written exercise. That in turn leads to the habit of transferring *en bloc* chunks of language from the source to their own paper without in any way making it their own. When told that they must write out of their own experience, they are apt to feel that they have no experience worth writing about. This (perhaps justified) humility must be broken down, for unless as freshmen they learn to use language to communicate their own experiences, they will not later be

able to write effectively, honestly, and forcefully.

This manner of approach will necessitate that the early themes be on conventional and apparently trivial subjects (for example, the well-worn *Why I Came to Washington University, How To Teach a Sister To Drive*). But if the instructor sticks to the principle of requiring that what the student writes must mean something and not be a mere repetition of words, such themes will not be easy for the student. They will require considerable preliminary exercise in class in the collection and evaluation of material. The students will be strongly resistant; they will (perhaps subconsciously) wish either to parrot conventional phrases or to repeat some already formulated instruction book.

The second phase, occupying the remainder of the first semester, is the application of the student's own experience to general statements made by others. Now he begins to read essays, preferably those that state in clear and simple language fundamental human problems. He will have to be impressed with the fact that any such general statement is meaningless unless it is given specific content, and that that specific content should come from people and things he has observed and experiences he has passed through. Again, the instructor will have to exercise all his talents to overcome resistance, although if the ideas from the first phase have taken effect in the student's mind, his task will be somewhat lighter. It will still take rigorous thinking and rigorous intellectual discipline, however, to make the student see that something which has been reported in the morning newspaper is not what is wanted to fill out the general-

¹ Washington University, Saint Louis

ization, but that something which happened at his own breakfast table is.

At the same time, if the materials for reading are wisely chosen he will be exposed to ideas of fundamental importance, clearly and effectively expressed. By relating such ideas to his own life and observations, he should be stimulated to find significance in his experience that he had not been aware of and should be exposed to the influence of models of thought and expression. By the end of the first semester, therefore, the student should have achieved a sense of the value of his own experience as a source of something to say that will be of interest to others, a sense of the difference between first and secondhand sources of information, a sense of the importance of filling generalization with specific content from his own experience, and perhaps a beginning toward the drawing of valid generalization from his own experience.

The third phase, occupying the first six or eight weeks of the second semester, deals with the use of secondhand sources, both of fact and the interpretation of fact. For the purposes of freshman composition a relatively clear distinction can be made between fact and its interpretation, and the student should be put at once to the analysis of selected printed material for this important distinction. In dealing with the factual content of his sources, the student should learn to question and evaluate the authority upon which the statements rest. He should then learn to assimilate such facts as meet the tests of acceptability. Working upon the foundation laid in the first semester, the instructor should make the student see that unless fact derived from secondhand sources is made a part of the fabric of his mind in the same way that fact from his own experience is, it does not really belong to him at all. In dealing with the interpretation of fact the

student should learn to evaluate it by the test of his own firsthand experience, by at least the elementary rules of evidence, and by the evaluation of the authority behind the interpretation.

The major written exercise covering this phase should be the old-fashioned research paper, of which the subject should be basically factual rather than interpretive. The instructor should examine the completed paper for evidence that the student has actually assimilated information from diverse sources into his thinking and has produced an organic whole, not a patchwork. Interpretation from sources may be included, but only if it is clearly recognized as such. Greater emphasis should be put upon the student's own interpretation of the facts, which again he should recognize as such and be prepared to defend.

The fourth phase, occupying the remainder of the second semester, should apply and extend the methods of thought previously inculcated in the first three phases to works of imaginative literature: stories, novels, plays, poetry. There are two reasons for taking up such works at this point. The first is to provide a certain amount of relaxation from the intellectual rigors of the earlier parts of the course; the second and more valid is to show the student that reading of imaginative literature is productive of experience, and that writing about reading in such forms (*i.e.*, "criticism") is like writing about any other experience. It would be dangerous to introduce this kind of material for theme subjects earlier in the course, since the average freshman is practically without experience in the handling of literary critical ideas and is particularly open to the danger of parroting formulaic phrases without understanding their content. The exercises in writing in this phase should be a number of papers somewhat shorter than the "research paper" of the third phase. In

these critical papers the student should be encouraged to explore his own responses to his reading by the same rigorous standards maintained in the earlier phases. The instructor moreover should examine the student's writing with the same rigor that he examined the earlier writing, testing for the same points; *i.e.*, validity as a communication of the student's own experience, discrimination in sifting fact from opinion and in the synthesis of fact derived at second-hand with that of firsthand, proper eval-

uation of the opinion of others, the welding of the whole into an integral composition.

In conclusion I should perhaps emphasize that the foregoing is intended only to provide a *rationale* for the course and in no way to signalize a slackening in the instructor's demand for the clearest and most effective expression the student is capable of. Within the given framework will fit all the conventional elements, from formal grammar to the search for an expressive metaphor.

Secretary's Report No. 6

JEROME W. ARCHER¹

Meeting of Executive Committee, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Parlor E, Hotel Statler, Boston, Massachusetts, Thursday, November 27, 1952, 5:00 p.m. Chairman Harold B. Allen presiding. Fourteen officers and members of the Executive Committee present: Allen, Dykema, Barnhart, Wykoff, Davis, Webb (proxy for Hodges), Shoemaker, Archer, Mason, Turpin, Lawson, Beauchamp, Geist, Morton.

1. Associate Chairman Karl Dykema reported on the 1952 Spring Meeting at Cleveland: \$1008.00, receipts; \$699.20, disbursements, and \$25.00 advance from N.C.T.E. repaid; 278 persons attended and paid registration fee (actual attendance was substantially higher, probably totaling 400-500 persons); attendance represented thirty different states, largest numbers coming from the following: Ohio (68), Michigan (36), Illinois (22), Pennsylvania (21), and Indiana, New York, and Wisconsin (15 each); on the

Program, 83 persons represented 24 states and District of Columbia.

2. Assistant Chairman T. A. Barnhart, in charge of the 1953 Spring Meeting in Chicago, introduced Mr. Herman C. Bowersox, Roosevelt College, Chairman of the Local Committee for that meeting.

3. Assistant Chairman Barnhart reported that a limited inquiry among members of the CCCC showed fifty to fifty-five per cent in favor of an extension of the Spring Meetings to beyond the present provision for a one-and-a-half-day meeting. After considerable discussion, a motion that the Spring Meeting be extended, if possible, to a total of two days, Thursday noon to Saturday noon, was carried.

4. George S. Wykoff, Editor pro tem of *College Composition and Communication* (CCC), who was in charge of the CCCC exhibit booth at the Boston N.C.T.E. meeting, recommended that hereafter a Membership Committee be in charge of CCCC exhibit booths at conventions.

¹ Secretary pro tem.

5. Editor Wykoff reported that responses (30) to a questionnaire sent to members of CCCC were favorable to present editorial policies of CCC, and did not favor book reviews or controversial articles.

6. A motion to approve Mr. Wykoff's panel from which Mr. Wykoff will appoint six members for the Editorial Committee of CCC was carried.

7. Mr. Lawson raised the question of promotional and publicity devices for CCCC and CCC. Chairman Allen observed that his own letters (to more than 1000 persons) and those of other officers and members of the Executive Committee, as well as the distribution of CCCC FACTS, an 8-page pamphlet sent out this fall, have brought results. The Committee favored, though it took no formal action upon, Mr. Lawson's recommendation that sample copies, or portions thereof, of CCC be sent out for promotional purposes.

(The meeting was temporarily adjourned at 6:00 P.M., and re-convened at 8:00 P.M.)

8. Considerable discussion was devoted to the question of whether or not we should have regional meetings as well as a national Spring meeting in 1954. It was the general feeling of the Committee that regional meetings were desirable but probably not practical. A motion was carried that in 1954 a national Spring Meeting be held and that the Chairman will also explore the possibilities of regional meetings in the same year. (The sense of this motion was that regional meetings, if held, would not be held simultaneously with the national meeting, and would be held preferably after the national meeting.)

9. A motion that the Executive Committee strongly recommends a minimum rental charge of \$25.00 per exhibit booth at the annual Spring Meetings was carried.

10. It was moved that the 1954 Spring Meeting be in St. Louis, Missouri. The motion was carried unanimously.

11. A motion was carried that a committee be appointed to study the practicability of an employment exchange in the CCCC.

12. It was moved and carried that a request be made to the NCTE Executive Committee for permission to grant an associate membership in CCCC to any paid-up member of the Speech Association of America simply upon payment of the current CCCC annual dues.

13. It was moved and carried unanimously that an amendment to the By-Laws be submitted to the membership for approval, said amendment to call for replacing By-Law 6 with one stipulating the use of Sturgis's *Standard Guide to Parliamentary Procedure*, in place of Roberts's *Rules of Order*.

14. Discussion was given to the question of whether or not it would be advisable to remove a member from the Executive Committee if he became dissociated from the type of school (e.g., university, technical school, etc.) with which he was associated at the time of election to the Committee. It was felt that there was no need to remove such a member from the Committee, since the Constitution provides for distribution only "so far as practicable" (see Article VII, Section 2, b.).

15. Discussion was devoted to the advisability of establishment of a permanent membership committee. The sentiment was that planning and working for increased membership were the duties of the Executive Committee.

16. Mr. Irwin Griggs, Chairman of the Committee for the Study of the Professional Status of the Teacher of Composition and Communication, reported:

(1) That the members of his committee (others are to be added) are:

Jerome Archer, Marquette University; Donald Bird, Stephens College; D. V. Bryan, University of Minnesota; Norton Crowell, University of New Mexico; Leonard Dean, University of Connecticut; Miss Doris Garey, Fisk University; Robert Gorrell, University of Nevada; Mrs. Madalene Shindler, University of Houston; William Sutton, Ball State Teachers College; Irwin Griggs, Temple University, Chairman. Further names for this committee were recommended to Mr. Griggs for his consideration.

(2) Mr. Griggs outlined the scope of the preliminary survey which might be conducted by his committee. General approval was given to his report. There was no consensus on whether or not the survey should be conducted by questions or personal interview, although it was the sentiment that both methods might be used. It was also judged advisable that the survey be completed in one academic year, and that probably all members of the N. C. T. E. College Section might be asked to work for the committee. Mr. Griggs and his committee will try to report on their progress at the Executive Committee meeting at the Spring Meeting of the CCCC in Chicago in March, 1953.

17. The motion was carried that the CCCC explore the possibility of cooper-

ating with other associations or groups concerned with teaching basic subjects (e.g., elementary mathematics, chemistry) to the end that summer workshops for training teachers be set up under the sponsorship of some foundation.

A special committee, C. Rexford Davis (Chairman), Loyd Douglas, John C. Gerber, George S. Wykoff, was appointed by the Chair, with the authorization of the Executive Committee, to study such possibility and to report on it at the Executive Committee meeting in Chicago in March, 1953.

18. No action was taken on study in certain areas, as previously recommended (see item 9, Minutes of Milwaukee Annual Business Meeting, November 24, 1950): (a) teaching load; (b) teacher-training for composition and communication; (c) diagnostic achievement tests, examinations, etc.; (d) articulation with high schools. It was observed that Mr. Griggs and his Committee (see item 16, above) are initiating a study which may result in recommendations on (a) and (b), and it was pointed out that (b), (c) and (d) will be the topics of workshops at the Chicago Spring Meeting, March, 1953.

19. The motion was carried that books published by members of CCCC, in unofficial capacities, not be displayed on the shelves of the CCCC exhibit booths at meetings.

20. The meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Secretary's Report No. 7

JEROME W. ARCHER¹

Annual Business Meeting, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Friday, November 28, 1952, (Luncheon meeting), Sky Room, Hotel

Bradford, Boston, Massachusetts, Chairman Harold B. Allen presiding. Number present: 136.

1. Chairman Harold B. Allen thanked Professor Newman Birk and Mrs.

¹ Secretary pro tem.

Birk for their gracious and successful planning for the luncheon.

2. Officers and members of the Executive Committee were introduced.

3. The minutes of the Annual Business Meeting, November 23, 1951, were approved as printed.

4. Chairman Allen reported on action taken at the Executive Committee meeting at Boston, 5:00 p.m. to 11:15 p.m. (recessed from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.)—See Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting, Items 3, 8, 10, 11, and 17 (*Secretary's Report No. 6*, this issue).

5. Chairman Allen, excerpting from his annual report to the NCTE, reported on the CCCC for November, 1951, to November 1952: (a) The CCCC strengthened its position and clarified its aims; (b) A successful program was sponsored at the 1951 NCTE Convention in Cincinnati; (c) Charles W. Roberts resigned from the editorship of CCC, effective with the publication of the May, 1952, issue. George S. Wykoff was appointed Editor pro tem; (d) A Constitution for the CCCC was approved in May by a mail vote (printed in CCC, October, 1952); (e) The year saw a slight increase in membership; (f) A major study under the direction of Irwin Griggs was initiated (see item 9, below); (g) Mr. Allen emphasized the importance of personal letters from members to prospective members, and also emphasized that the minimum quota of our aims for membership in CCCC should be at least one member in every college.

6. Associate Chairman Karl Dykema reported on the 1952 Spring Meeting at Cleveland—See Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting, Item 1 (*Secretary's Report No. 6*, this issue).

7. Assistant Chairman T. A. Barnhart presented, in mimeographed form, the tentative plans for the program at

the 1953 Spring Meeting which will be held at the Hotel Sherman, Chicago, March 12, 13, 14. Mr. Barnhart invited members to submit suggestions.

8. The treasurer reported that the financial condition for January 1, 1952–October 31, 1952, showed a balance on the latter date of \$1,055.24. There are 411 individual memberships, thirty-four institutional - sustaining memberships, and seventeen library subscriptions to CCC.

9. Irwin Griggs, Chairman of the Committee for the Study of the Professional Status of the Teacher of Composition and Communication, presented his report (see Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Item 16, *Secretary's Report No. 6*, this issue).

10. Report of the Nominating Committee was given by Strang Lawson, Chairman.

11. It was moved and carried unanimously that the report of the Nominating Committee be accepted as a report and that the assembly cast a ballot for the election of the following persons listed in the report:

- a. Chairman: Karl Dykema, Youngstown College
- b. Associate Chairman: T. A. Barnhart, State Teachers, St. Cloud
- c. Secretary: Beverly E. Fisher, Santa Monica City College
- d. Editor, CCC: George S. Wykoff, Purdue University
- e. Members of the Executive Committee: Richard S. Beale, Boston University; Wayne C. Booth, Haverford; George P. Faust, Kentucky; Carl Lefevre, Pace College; Sister Miriam Joseph, C.S.C., St. Mary's (Indiana); Mrs. Jean Malmstrom, Western Michigan College of Education; Herbert B. Nelson, Oregon State College; Robert E. Tuttle, General Motors Institute.

12. In addition to Henry Sams, University of Chicago, proposed by the Nominating Committee for the office of Assistant Chairman, Freida Johnson, Geo. Peabody College for Teachers, and Jerome W. Archer, Marquette University, were nominated from the floor. Mr. Archer was elected.

13. Gladys Brown, Little Rock Junior College, and Irwin Griggs, Temple University, were nominated and elected as members of the Executive Committee. (Harold B. Allen as retiring Chairman will serve for one year as an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee—Constitution, Art. IV, Sect. 1, e.)

14. At this point, the retiring Chair-

man turned the meeting over to the new Chairman, Karl Dykema.

15. Mr. Allen pointed out that, as the Constitution requires, the vacancy on the Executive Committee caused by the election of Mr. Archer as Assistant Chairman is to be filled by appointment by the newly elected Chairman. (NOTE: To fill this and one other vacancy not filled at the meeting, Chairman Karl Dykema has appointed the following: Mrs. Marguerite H. Morey, Colby Junior College, New London, New Hampshire, and Karl Young, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.)

16. The meeting adjourned at 2:50 P.M.

Editorial Comment

Editorial Board members for 1953 are listed on the title page. These represent our various types of institutions, different geographical areas, and different areas of interest: composition, communication, and language. Our feminine membership will be represented when replacements are made, in the due course of time, for some of those named.

By the provisions of the CCCC Constitution (Article IV, Section 3), "Each member shall serve for a period of three years, two members retiring and being replaced each year." To make this fully effective in the future, two of the present board have kindly agreed to serve for only one year and two for two years.

There is at present no rigid editorial policy, except to find and publish material of interest and value to teachers of composition and/or communication. Answers to a questionnaire sent to present (i.e., 1952) and former CCCC officers and members of the Executive Committee show the following kinds of material checked as "desirable":

General or national discussions of composition and/or communication.

Selected papers given at our national meetings in March and November.

Accounts of specific programs (if not too conventional).

Accounts of special projects or teaching devices.

Accounts of research or experimental procedures.

Workshop summaries (as in the past).

Current Bibliography (appropriate sections of that formerly published in *College English*).

In addition to usual-length articles, briefer articles, 300 to 1000 words.

The official bulletin, *College Composition and Communication*, and the CCCC membership are related in a direct proportion: the more members (individual and institutional) there are in CCCC, the larger and better (we hope) the magazine can become. The larger

and better the magazine, the more CCCC members there will be. The appeal and value of the magazine depend upon the written contributions of the

membership. Any materials of the kind labeled above as "desirable" will receive the most careful consideration by the Editorial Board. G. S. W.

CCCC Spring Meeting, 1953

Hope you're coming!

The time: Friday and Saturday, March 13, 14, 1953. Thursday evening registration, 8 to 10 P. M., Thursday evening, meeting of the Executive Committee. Friday and Saturday, registration and various meetings.

The place: Chicago, Illinois. Hotel Sherman. (For accommodations, write direct to the hotel.)

The program (as announced by Program Chairman T. A. Barnhart, State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota, with, in general, possible minor changes of one kind or another):

Three general sessions, opening on Friday morning with an address by Irving Lee on "How to Talk with People"; continuing on Friday night with a description of three representative freshman programs; ending with a luncheon and luncheon address Saturday noon and early afternoon.

Two groups of panel discussions, first group of three meeting the last half of Friday afternoon, the second group of three the last half of Saturday morning. Subjects: 1. What is New about Communication? 2. The Graduate Student and the Teaching of Freshmen. 3. Cooperation, Combination, Integration—how can various areas pool their materials? 4. A Graduated Approach to English Learnings. 5. Implications of Structural Grammar to the Teaching of English. 6. Potpourri—Testing.

Three workshop sessions, Friday morning, Friday afternoon, Saturday morning: sixteen topics, some continued from

previous years, some new. 1. From a Student's Reading and Listening to His Writing and Speaking. 2. The Terminal Student. 3. National Entrance Tests and Minimum Standards. 4. Preparation of the Communication or Composition Teacher. 5. Subfreshman Composition—The Poorly Equipped Student. 6. Super-freshman Composition—The Well Equipped Student. 7. The Psychology of the Student: How He Learns to Communicate. 8. Uses of Community Resources in Teaching Freshman English. 9. Status in the Profession of the Composition Teacher. 10. Improvement of Reading Ability. 11. The ABC's of the Combination of Written and Oral Communication. 12. Writing for Business and Industry. 13. Integration of High School and College Teaching of Composition. 14. Mass Media of Communication. 15. The Reading, Hearing, Speech Clinics as an Aid to Freshman Composition. 16. *The English Language Arts.*

The Local Committee: General Chairman, Hermann C. Bowersox, Roosevelt College; Treasurer, Robert E. Streeter, University of Chicago; Publishers' Displays, Richard C. Blakeslee, Northwestern University; Luncheon Arrangements, Mollie Cohen, Illinois Institute of Technology; Registration and Information Services: Falk Johnson, University of Illinois at Navy Pier (chairman); Pauline Rosaire, Herzl Junior College; Herbert Kalk, Wilson Junior College; Howard Wilcox, Wright Junior College; Irwin J. Suloway, Chicago Teachers College.